DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 368 EC 124 172

AUTHOR Young, Marsha; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of an Inservice Program: Summary Report of Intensive Training and Technical Assistance.
INSTITUTION National Technical Inst. for the Deaf, Rochester, N. Y.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Formative Evaluation; *Hearing Impairments; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

The paper reports on the formative evaluation of a career education national inservice training program for educators in 29 schools and programs for the hearing impaired. The inservice was divided into two stages: an intensive training workshop for administrators, teachers, and counselors; and technical assistance on goal planning and milestone reporting systems. Among results of the workshop evaluation were that participants' self reported level of participation was rated good to very good, with ratings tending to increase across successive workshops; participant posttest scores were significantly higher than pretests for three of the four workshop audiences; and media supporting the workshop strategies were very effective with a mixed deaf and hearing audience. Technical assistance evaluation covered dissemination, consultation, and networking aspects. Effective teamwork and a start at documenting a comprehensive career education plan were reported by the schools in each region during the 6 month period after intensive training. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188368

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF AN INSERVICE PROGRAM:

Summary Report of Intensive Training and Technical Assistance

by
Marsha Young
Instructional Programmer

John Lutz
Research Associate

Don Lichty
Media Specialist

and
Judy Egelston-Dodd
Coordinator, National Project
on Career Education

Presented by Judy Egelston-Dodd and Don Lichty
at AERA, annual meeting,
Boston, April, 1980

The coauthors are employed at
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
One Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, NY 14623

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judy Egelston-Dodd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC124172

Introduction

The very word "evaluation" may evoke chills of anxiety if not defensive reactions among developers, trainers and even management. It is certainly more comfortable and perhaps more personally rewarding to concentrate on the visible and appealing efforts of developing and kicking off a new and exciting program (not to mention more ego building!) than to sift through performance data, interview supervisors or site coordinators, and plug the leaky dike of analytical comparisons with statistical loopholes.

Commitment to quality in a training program is reflected in setting time aside for participants, assigning the best qualified trainers, and emphasizing highly relevant and well planned content. Commensurate commitment to quality in an evaluation effort requires the allocation of resources by program administrators, the cooperation of supervisory staff, and visible attachment of value to the feedback generated by the evaluation process (Woodington, 1980). With high level commitment, the prospects that the training program will make a valuable impact and effect change in the institution is greatly enhanced.

A major characteristic of formative evaluation is its focus on a specific project, audience and setting, a feature helpful in making program improvements but a liability for the generation of generalizable knowledge. For evaluation results to be generalizable, the data must be collected across time and settings (Bernhardt and Owens, 1979).

This report will focus on the formative evaluation of a two-stage national inservice training program for educators in 29 schools and programs for the

hearing impaired across two years duration. The intensive training stage consists of an 18-hour experiential workshop on career education and planning skills, four hours of which are scheduled as parallel sessions for: A) administrators, and B) teachers and counselors. This workshop was delivered to one prototype audience in Fall, 1978 and at four other regional sites in Fall, 1979. The technical assistance stage consists of a goal-planning and milestone reporting system within the network of schools represented at each workshop. Data collection in this second stage may last from six months to two years, depending on the unique plans and technical assistance needs of each participant program. Technical assistance was delivered to the prototype participants from November, 1978 through May, 1979 and is currently being evaluated formatively across the 29 programs which participated in the four regional workshops in Fall, 1979. Final evaluation of the technical assistance effort is scheduled at the end of the duration of the project in 1981.

Problem

Traditionally, education programs for hearing impaired students have emphasized basic skills. Although concern has been expressed for their career development, only isolated local efforts have impacted on career education program improvement for hearing impaired students.

Two national working conferences on career development for the hearing impaired were held in 1978 (Updegraff, Bishop, Steffan and Egelston-Dodd, 1979). Participants representing residential programs (first conference) and day programs (second conference) generated issues in career development

for the hearing impaired and then rated them for importance and for urgency. The need for inservice training in career education and a need for a comprehensive plan for implementing career education were highly urgent and most important for personnel from both residential schools and day programs.

On October 1, 1978 the National Project on Carer Education (NPCE) was was created, jointly supported from regular program funds by the Model Secondary School for the Deaf (MSSD) and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID). It's purpose was to focus specifically on inservice training in career education for educators working with primary, elementary and secondary level hearing impaired students. The long range goal for the NPCE is:

> Each state will have a model career education program and a cadre of career education facilitators who can help the personnel in other schools serving hearing impaired students to a) develop and implement plans for a comprehensive K-12 career education program, and b) infuse career education concepts into the school curriculum.

The questions which must be addressed in the interest of evaluation are:

Workshop Evaluation

1. Were participants' attitudes toward the workshop positive?
2. Did participants demonstrate significant learning as a result of the workshop?
3. Were the resources and the delivery system adequate for the effort?

Technical Assistance

1. Did the cadre from the participant schools each develop the feelings and skills related to effective teamwork?
2. Did the team members intend to begin to implement their career education programs by choosing the most effective implementation strategies?
3. Are the team members ready and able to serve as trainers and consultants in career education in their school and for local programs?

The long range criteria of success are based on outcomes related to the school programs themselves. The chart below details the criteria and the outcomes for each.

Criteria	Outcomes
A. Infusion	1. Adoption of the CCEM model or other CE model
	2. Analysis of local curriculum documents
	3. Evidence of stereotyping awareness
B. Collaboration	4. Establishment of a parent/community CE advisory committee
	5. Experiential student involvement
C. Skilled Trainers	6. Documentation of successful training experiences

D. Planning

7. Documentation of a school CE plan
8. Budget allocation for the CE plan

E. Change

9. Evidence of successful student involvement in CE
10. Teacher support for the CE plan
11. Standardized measures of change.

Methodology: Workshop Evaluation

Seven regular trainers and three adjunct trainers delivered the intensive training to 114 participants from 29 schools or programs in 21 states at four regional sites in Fall, 1979. The sites were Rochester, NY, Washington, D.C., St. Louis, MO and Berkeley, CA. Participants were exposed to the 22 modules on career education and planning skills in addition to the two halfday sessions devoted to delivery skills; i.e., how to become a consultant and career education facilitator.

Data Sources. Participant attitude was measured by:

A. a session questionnaire administered at the end of the workshop, assessing clarity of goals, level of participants' interest, comfort, satisfaction, participation, and trainer skill.

B. workshop evaluation form, which was also administered at the end of the workshop asking participants to cite new content, most useful concepts, high and low points, and recommend changes, and

C. feedback cards used spontaneously and voluntarily by participants to document evaluative comments as they were inspried by the workshop.

Participant learning was assessed by a pre-post test design. The pretest was completed and mailed in prior to the workshop, while the posttest was administered at the end of the workshop. Differences between pre- and posttest scores were assessed with one-tailed, independent t-tests because sample sizes were unequal and nonproportional and this procedure was determined to have more statistical power than the general analysis of variance. Comparisons between workshops were made using an analysis of covariance, with the pretest scores as a covariate.

The analyses of the resources and the delivery system were handled descriptively using trainer attitude measures. Each trainer completed a module evaluation form prior to presenting a module and again after the intensive training program was completed for all four regional workshops. All trainers also responded to the instrument, the Team Development Scale (Dyer, 1977), to determine the characteristics of teamwork, a criterion established for successful training. Observation data were also collected by two evaluators on site to document a) trainer adherence to script and timing requirements, b) media quality, and c) effectiveness of use of media and facilities.

Results. The workshop evaluation results may be summarized as follows.

A. Participant Attitude

1. Session Questionnaire (Table 1)

- Participant understanding of workshop objectives was somewhat fuzzy prior to the workshops, but clear to very

clear after the workshop. Post workshop understanding was higher for St. Louis and Berkeley participants.

- Participants' self-reported level of participation was rated good to very good. The ratings tended to increase across the successive workshops.
- Participants' level of comfort was good to excellent. The lowest ratings were given by Rochester participants where room temperature and space were cited as problems.
- Participants' level of interest was rated moderate to high, with the lowest ratings given by the Rochester participants.
- Trainer skill was rated very good to excellent, with the lowest ratings given by the Rochester participants.
- Participants' satisfaction with the learning was moderate to good, with the Rochester participants reporting the lowest satisfaction.

2. Workshop Evaluation Form (Table 2)

- In the model workshop, "Career Education and Planning Skills" the topics most cited as new and most useful were infusion and systematic planning and implementation. The content on systematic planning and implementation was also cited by a moderate number of participants as a high point of the workshop.

- The high points cited most frequently included the sharing among participants, the energy and skill of the trainers and the fun generated by the experiential format and high involvement atmosphere. A few participants cited these categories as low points, especially the trainers' style.
- The low points cited most frequently related to the rushed feeling caused by covering so much content, lack of depth in the general career education content, the apparent disorganization caused by late starts, media problems, and repetitious snack food, and as mentioned before, trainer style. At each site several participants cited no low points.

3. Feedback cards (Table 3)

- Participants in each successive workshop after Rochester submitted more positive than negative feedback.

B. Participant Learning

1. Pretests/Posttests (Table 4)

- Participant posttest scores were found to be significantly higher than pretests for three of the four workshop audiences, using one-tailed independent t-tests.

- Using the pretest scores as a covariate control, an ANCOVA comparison of posttests between workshops revealed significant differences. The Newman-Keuls technique for multiple comparisons identified Rochester participants scoring significantly higher on the delivery skills test. There were no other differences in achievement between sites.

C. Resources and Delivery System Adequacy

1. Trainer Module Evaluation Forms (Table 5)

- All trainers reporting expressed no more than moderate concern about presenting any module. For ten modules only minimum concern was expressed.
- After delivering the modules through all four workshops, trainers recommended minimum revision for 12 modules, moderate revision for seven modules, and extensive revision for three modules.

2. Team Development Scale: Trainers (Table 6)

- The NPCE training team scored highest on task orientation, intimacy and cohesiveness, and planning and communication.
- Team regard for the leader was very good, allowing them to report an easy relationship and mutual respect.
- The two lowest aspects (rated fair to good) were equality of responsibility and effective conflict management. The team felt that conflict was recognized and sometimes

resolved in team meetings. Responsibility for progress was shared by most but not all team members.

3. Observation Data

- Trainer consistency of delivery and script was very high. Material was sometimes condensed to abide by time limits set in the script or by the workshop schedule.
- Media supporting the workshop strategies were very effective with a mixed deaf and hearing audience. Participant notebooks will include copies of all supporting transparencies to make notetaking unnecessary.
- Support services provided by site coordinators, interpreters, and clerical staff in the host institutions were good to excellent. The role of the interpreter was clarified for group interaction since all trainers signed for themselves in every module at every site.

Methodology: Technical Assistance Evaluation

The technical assistance provided thus far by the NPCE has been defined by the unique resource needs of the participant schools. Categorically, the services provided cover:

A. dissemination of information on commercial CE materials, research results, curriculum products, funding sources, and training opportunities;

B. consultation with CE teams, by phone and/or on-site visits, providing assistance with planning and with inservice training; and

C. networking among the participant schools within a region using the NPCE planning and reporting system and circulation of a monthly newsletter to share each program's progress.

Data Sources. The Team Development Scale (Dyer, 1977) was used to determine the extent to which each team had developed feelings related to the factors of leadership, cohesiveness and skills in decision-making, conflict resolution and task orientation.

In a comprehensive study of how innovations work and what factors affecting educational change in local schools might be, the Rand Corporation, in its now famous report (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978), identified ineffective as well as effective implementation strategies. Ineffective implementation strategies were found to be dissonant with local district realities or with needs and motivations of teachers. Effective strategies, on the other hand, promoted mutual adaptation in the institutional setting while encouraging teachers and administrators to adapt as well. If a local school desired to implement innovative career education activities, for example, certain strategies would be encouraged and others discouraged to put the activities into successful practice according to the results of the Rand study.

Information was sought from each team through the Workshop Evaluation Form to identify the career education implementation strategies participants planned to use upon return to their local schools. In this manner, project trainers could discourage the use of ineffective strategies while encouraging

teams to use effective strategies through the technical assistance phase of the project.

Evidence of curriculum infusion, including adoption of the CCEM components, analysis of existing objectives to determine the appropriate points for infusion, and intervention in stereotyped attitudes regarding sex, race and/or deafness, will be submitted using the milestone reporting system during the technical assistance stage, prior to NPCE accreditation as a model program. The format will be unique to each program, but dual objectives for content and career education will be highlighted with activities designed to implement both sets of objectives. All curriculum materials submitted by participant schools will be disseminated to members in the regional network.

Evidence of readiness to serve as a CE consultant and facilitator for programs within the state will involve self-assessment using a criterion checklist for trainers' skills. Team members may apply the criterion list to each other or use videotapes of their training experiences for self-rating. Training skills include platform skills, skills related to style and to processing, a questioning technique used to analyze an experiential strategy and reflect on the learning.

The technical assistance stage will also be used to evaluate the extent to which the objectives for the entire project are met. Data documenting collaboration, planning, and training efforts will be collected by means of the planning and milestone reporting forms. The use of these forms is taught in the context of the workshop. Practice is provided in a double planning module where each team develops a "pre-plan" with three goals as part of their comprehensive CE plan.

The outcomes of change will be assessed using documentation of student achievement, teachers' testimonial support for the comprehensive CE plan and several standardized instruments.

The Trouble Shooting Checklist (Manning, 1976) measures an organization's potential for successfully adopting and implementing educational innovations, and was used with the 29 participant schools to a) provide a norm-referenced predictive score which estimates the likelihood of a program to accept and internalize the new career education plan (the "innovation" referred to above), b) provide a diagnostic profile which focuses on strengths and weaknesses of a school's environment in relation to the adoption and implementation of the new career education plan, and c) provide a diagnostic tool to help plan intervention strategies appropriate for a specific school.

The Trouble Shooting Checklist (TCS) was sent to each team to be completed as a first task for the school team after returning home from the intensive training at the regional workshop. One response form was returned from 14 out of 29 participating schools representing a consensus of the team members' opinions. It is expected that the TSC will be completed by the remaining schools within the period of technical assistance.

A unique TSC profile constructed for each school identified its strengths and weaknesses in seven areas (scales) deemed important for successful adoption and implementation of career education. National norms were available to compare participant schools with public school districts. Local norms were developed to show relative strengths and weaknesses among the scores for the 14 participant schools which have responded to date. After scores and norms were determined for each of the seven scales and 14 schools, indicators

of strengths and weaknesses were defined. If a scale score exceeded the normative distribution by more than one standard deviation from the mean, it was identified as significant. If it exceeded the mean by more than two standard deviations, it was identified as a major strength or weakness.

Another instrument, the Stages of Concern questionnaire (1974), was selected to measure the concerns of individuals (as opposed to program aspects tapped by the TSC) about a specified innovation, following a theoretical model showing developmental movement through different types of concerns. Scores on the SOC will a) provide project evaluators with an overall prespective and description of the relative intensity of the progressive stages of concern about the career education program for participant team members, and b) assist in diagnosing the need for appropriate additional staff development activities commensurate with the concern levels identified within schools or within regions.

The SOC was completed and returned by mail by all individual participants prior to attending the four regional workshops in Fall, 1979, as part of their pre-workshop test package. It will be administered again in May, 1980 and in May, 1981 to monitor the development of concern through the levels defined in the theoretical model.

The relationship between the two instruments selected to monitor change is important. In order for an individual change agent, as the NPCE participants are designed to be, to evolve through the stages of concern (as identified by the SOC) progressively through the adoption and implementation process, their school environment must meet certain conditions and be in an appropriate

state of readiness. The TSC was designed to predict and diagnose the school's state of readiness.

The Career Education Needs Assessment, used by participants in the workshop provides diagnostic information for the team members in each school to plan for the implementation of the innovation. These data are needed by participants for developing means to achieve specific objectives in their school, and would have little or no value to project evaluators in suggesting appropriate inservice activities or technical assistance. This instrument, therefore, is not used for evaluation purposes, although each school team will be expected to apply their data in their own school setting.

Results. The technical assistance evaluation results may be summarized as follows:

A. Team Development Scale: Participants (Table 7)

- Items on the Team Development Scale were grouped according to one of four factors inherent in the item meaning. The four factors were intimacy, task orientation, planning and leadership. Relative team strengths for Rochester participants were intimacy and planning; planning and orientation for Washington; intimacy, orientation, and leadership for St. Louis; and planning and leadership for Berkeley.
- Comments regarding increasing the effectiveness of team functioning included more time and more team members for Rochester participants; more time and a stronger career education knowledge base for Washington; and more time and better communication and follow-through for Berkeley. There were no team-related needs cited by St. Louis participants.

- The NPCE trainer ratings of participant team functioning and actual participant ratings were not significantly correlated; nor were they meaningful in terms of relevant variance. This observation tends to raise questions about the validity of the scale.

B. Ineffective vs. Effective Implementation Strategies (Table 8)

- Fewer than one-third (30.9%) of the total number of strategies selected by workshop participants were regarded by Berman and McLaughlin (1978) as ineffective. Most popular choice of the ineffective strategies was use of outside consultants (8.8%).
- Effective strategy selection accounted for 69.1% of the total responses. The most popular choice was for teacher participation in project decisions (15.5%). The lowest selection rate for effective strategies was teacher observation of similar projects (4.4%).

C. The Trouble Shooting Checklist (Manning, 1976).

- Individual schools show unique profiles of strengths and weaknesses. These data will be useful as diagnostic information upon which to build additional technical assistance activities.
- The scale for central administration is a consistent significant weakness of these schools perhaps because the concept isn't applicable. Many schools for the deaf are private institutions

operated by a board of trustees, with no higher administrative figure than the school superintendent.

D. Documentation of Comprehensive CE Plan

- Seven out of eight schools which participated in the prototype program submitted comprehensive plans. Planning forms and implementation report forms were revised based on input from the prototype users. These data are available upon request from the project coordinator.
- Teams of participants from the 29 schools completed and submitted a pre-plan for implementing a new CE program or for strengthening their current CE program. Reports for implementing the first three goals have been submitted by 22 of the 29 schools, and progress has been reported by every program. One newsletter issue was disseminated in February, 1980.
- Major milestone reports and requests for heavy technical assistance will be received through May, 1980. Less structured monitoring of progress will continue through May, 1981 for these 29 schools while heavy technical assistance is scheduled for the thirty new schools or programs during the last year of the project.

Conclusions

The NPCE workshop evaluation and technical assistance follow-up have progressed to the point where some specific conclusions and recommendations

may be made. The intensive training in career education, planning skills and the delivery skills dealing with consulting and training skills was given in four sites with successively greater success, as measured by participant attitude. Significant learning occurred in three of the four sites, and the amount learned was comparable across the four iterations when entering knowledge was controlled. The workshop was well supported by the host institutions, the trainers and their sponsoring institutions so that resources and the delivery system were adequate for the effort.

Revision efforts on the Trainers Manual are started, and the final package will be ready for trial use in a ripple (replication) workshop delivered by the team at the California School for the Deaf - Berkeley in April, 1980. The replication will cover only the model workshop on "Career Education and Planning Skills." Delivery skills are covered only in the NPCE regional workshops for CE facilitators.

An additional measure of workshop success is the extent to which planning for implementation of a CE program has progressed in the six-month period after the intensive training. Effective teamwork and a start at documenation of a comprehensive CE plan have both been reported by the schools in each region. Dissemination of curriculum guides available from participant schools and displayed at the regional workshops has amounted to 49 pieces mailed to 20 schools. In addition some information on commercially available materials has been disseminated to each school. As infusion and curriculum development efforts become more intensive, the dissemination of products will represent a heavy obligation for technical assistance.

Community involvement via collaborative efforts may be facilitated by the use of a series of four films which have been purchased by NTID and captioned for use by the NPCE participant schools. The four films, "The Board of Education Debates: Career Education," Parts I-IV, depict a typical community and school situation. U.S. Office of Career Education director, Kenneth Hoyt, reflects on the content of the debate with a knack for driving home the concepts he wishes to promote. These four captioned films will be part of the technical assistance package available on loan to participant programs which are initiating community involvement and collaboration.

Monitoring of the criteria for change will continue over the duration of the project. The outcomes specified for project success are already beginning to take shape. The application of resources from the combined support of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf will result in changes and long range improvements in the career education programs to which deaf students are exposed in grades K-12.

Table 1. Attitude Ratings for Four Regional Workshops
(Scale of 1 = low, 5 = high)

Attitude Criteria	Site			
	Rochester	Washington*	St. Louis	Berkeley
1. Understanding of workshop objectives				
Prior to session	2.3	—	2.0	3.0
After session	4.2	—	4.5	4.5
2. Level of Participation	3.3	—	3.8	4.1
3. Level of Comfort with Atmosphere	3.8	—	4.5	4.4
4. Level of Interest	3.6	—	4.6	4.5
5. Level of Trainees' Skill	4.2	—	4.6	4.5
6. Level of Satisfaction Regarding Learning	3.5	—	4.2	4.2

* The Session Questionnaire was not used for Washington participants. A questionnaire created specially for Gallaudet College, Pre College Division was used.

Table 2. Aspects of Workshop Cited by Participants in Four Regional Workshops

Aspects of Workshop	Number of Times Cited (all participants)			
	New (Big Ideas)	Most Useful	High Points	Low Points
Infusion	25	29	0	0
CCEM	9	12	0	0
Decision Making	13	7	0	0
Collaboration	8	5	0	0
Delivery Skills	24	13	6	5
Systematic Planning/Implementation	9	28	17	0
Sharing Time	1	4	25	2 (too few deaf participants
Teamwork	0	1	13	0
Environment (Experiential Format)	0	0	23	6
Trainers	0	0	25	17
Materials (Resources)	0	4	16	6 (too much)
Ice Breakers	0	1	2	4
Pace (too fast)	0	0	0	17
Pace (too slow)	0	0	0	11
Preworkshop Material	0	0	1	5
Career Education (General)	3	7	9	14
Organization	0	0	12	13
Autonomy of Programs	0	0	3	0

Table 3. Feedback Cards for Four Regional Workshops

	Rochester	Washington, DC	St. Louis	Berkeley*
# Positive Comment Cards	10	27	89	13+
# Negative Comment Cards	19	21	75	19+

* Missing Data (cards lost)

Table 4. Content Test Results

A. Comparison of Content Pretests and Posttests

Workshop	Pretest			Posttest			t
	m	SD	n	M	SD	n	
Rochester	17.61	4.00	26	21.21	3.32	23	3.39*
Washington	18.33	3.30	15	20.13	3.29	15	1.49
St. Louis	17.10	2.78	29	20.75	3.89	29	4.11*
Berkeley	17.50	3.20	26	19.55	2.81	29	2.53*
Total	17.54	3.31	96	20.40	3.37	96	5.93*

* $p < .05$

B. ANCOVA of Workshop Posttests

Workshop	Posttest Scores[a]				Control Pretest
	CE and Planning	Delivery	Total		
	n	M	M	M	n	M
Rochester	23	11.31	9.92*	21.23	26	17.61
Washington	15	11.77	8.25	20.02	15	18.33
St. Louis	29	12.74	8.07	20.81	29	17.10
Berkeley	26	11.46	8.04	19.50	26	17.50

[a] adjusted for covariate

* $p < .001$

Table 5. Trainer Module Evaluation

Module	Trainer Response	Ave. Prep. Time (min)	Extent of Concern Before Delivery	Extent of Changes Recommended After Delivery
1	2/3	37	moderate	moderate
2	3/3	17	minimum	minimum
3	2/3	30	minimum	moderate
4	1/3	40	moderate	minimum
5	3/4	45	moderate	extensive
6	1/2	45	moderate	minimum
7	1/2	no data	minimum	minimum
8	1/3	15	moderate	moderate
9	3/4	40	moderate	extensive
10	3/4	30	moderate	minimum
11	3/3	25	moderate	moderate
12A	2/4	50	minimum	minimum
13A	2/4	50	moderate	extensive
14A	2/3	23	minimum	minimum
15A	2/3	23	minimum	moderate
12B	2/3	23	moderate	minimum
13B	1/2	20	minimum	minimum
14B	2/3	30	minimum	minimum
15B	2/3	10	minimum	moderate
16	1/3	20	moderate	minimum
17	1/3	15	moderate	minimum
18	2/3	15	moderate	moderate

A - parallel modules for administrators covering implementation
B - parallel modules for teachers and counselors covering infusion of the CCEM

Table 6. Team Development Scale: Trainers

	Factors	Continuums: Average Rating			
1.	Intimacy and Cohesiveness	Ill at ease, under wraps	1	Ave. 4.3	5 Completely free and expressive, a close team.
2.	Task Orientation and Responsibility	No clear or meaningful goals. Team loafed and made no progress. No one took responsibility.	1	Ave. 4.2	5 Goals understood clearly. Definite progress achieved. Each member assumed responsibility.
3.	Planning and Communication	Only one or two members influenced team.	1	Ave. 4.3	5 All members shared ideas before plans and decisions were made.
4.	Leadership	Ignored or suppressed conflicts. Leader dominates. Members fearful or passive.	1	Ave. 3.8	5 Conflict resolved satisfactorily Leader respected. No one dominates.

Table 7. Team Development Scale: Participants
A = Rochester, B = Washington, C = St. Louis, D = Berkeley

	Factor		Continuuums: Average Ratings							
1.	Intimacy and Cohesiveness	Ill at ease, under wraps.	1	B 3.2		D 3.4	C 3.5	A 4.0		5 Completely free and expressive, a close team.
2.	Task Orientation and Responsibility	No clear or meaningful goals. No progress. No one took responsibility.	1	C/D 3.2	B 3.3	A 3.4				5 Goals clearly understood. Definite progress. Each member assumed responsibility.
3.	Planning and Communication	Only 1 or 2 members influenced the team.	1					B/C 4.4	A/D 4.5	5 All members shared ideas before plans and decisions were made.
4.	Leadership	Members ignored or suppressed conflicts. Leader dominates. Members fearful or passive.	1				A 4.3	B 4.4	C/C 4.5	5 Conflict resolved satisfactorily in team meetings. Leader respected and is not dominating.

Table 8. Selection Rate for Implementation Strategies

A. Ineffective Strategies	Workshop Site[a] Rochester n	%	St. Louis n	%	Berkeley n	%	Totals n	%
Outside consultants	10	10	13	7.1	19	9.8	42	8.8
Packaged management approaches	1	1	4	2.2	8	4.1	13	2.7
One-shot, pre-implementation training	1	1	9	4.9	10	5.2	20	4.2
Pay for training	1	1	5	2.7	5	2.6	11	2.3
Formal evaluation	4	4	16	8.7	11	5.7	31	6.5
Comprehensive project	5	5	11	6.0	14	7.2	30	6.3
Sub Total	22	22	58	31.7	67	34.7	147	30.9

B. Effective Strategies	Workshop Site[a] Rochester n	%	St. Louis n	%	Berkeley n	%	Totals n	%
Concrete, teacher-specific; and extended training	10	10	16	8.7	15	7.8	41	8.6
Classroom assistance from project staff	12	12	18	9.8	11	5.7	41	8.6
Teacher observation of similar projects	5	5	6	3.3	10	5.2	21	4.4
Regular project meetings on practical problems	15	15	24	13.1	23	11.9	62	13.0
Teacher participation in project decisions	20	20	28	15.3	26	13.5	74	15.5
Local materials development	14	14	16	8.7	22	11.4	52	10.9
Principal participation in training	2	2	17	9.3	19	9.8	38	8.0
Sub Total	78	78	125	68.3	126	65.3	329	69.1
Total number of responses (ineffective and effective strategies)	100	100	183	100	193	100	476	100

[a]No data were available from Washington, DC workshop.

REFERENCES

Bermen, P. and M. W. McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. VII; Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. USOE-R-1598/8. HEW, May, 1978.

Bernhardt, V. L. and T. R. Owens. Experience Based Career Education, Evaluation Synthesis of Second Year Pilot Sites. Education and Work Program, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Paper presented at AERA, annual meeting, San Francisco, 1979.

Manning, B. A. "The Trouble Shooting Checklist (TSC) for School Based Settings." Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations/CBAM Project. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. University of Texas. Austin, Texas, 1976.

Stages of Concern. Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations/CBAM Project. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1974.

Updegraff, D. R., M. E. Bishop, R. C. Staffan, and J. C. Egelston-Dodd. Career Development for the Hearing Impaired: Proceedings of Two Working Conferences. MSSD/NTID National Project on Career Education. Outreach Office Gallaudet College, Washington, DC, June, 1979.

Woodington, D. "Some Impressions of the Evaluation of Training in Industry." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 61 (5), January, 1980, 326-328.

Ron H
9/25-